



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076

25944 7590 01/12/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/923,440

Applicant(s)

MATSUNAGA, HIDEKI

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's communication filed on 08/08/2001.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,412,070 issued to Van Dyke et al. (hereinafter Van Dyke) in view of US Patent No. 6,275,825 issued to Kobayashi et al. (hereinafter Kobayashi).

With respect to claim 1, Van Dyke discloses setting an access right in association with the retrieval condition; and performing access control for an object matching the retrieval condition on the basis of the access right ().

Van Dyke discloses extending access control of system objects, maintaining control access rights in a computing environment. The system allow an application to

Art Unit: 2172

operate on a requested object and to retrieve the security descriptor by operating system to examine the access control list stored within the retrieved security descriptor. Van Dyke does not explicitly teach defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object.

However, Kobayashi discloses using SQL or SELECT statement to retrieve, to set or change a retrieved stored object with the access right (col. 1, lines 15-35 and lines 58-67 and col. 2, lines 1-20 and col. 4, lines 20-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Van Dyke with the teachings of Kobayashi so as to retrieval a stored object in the system with the condition based on the access right of the user (Kobayashi - col. 2, lines 1-14 and col. 4, lines 8-41). This combination would have made a method for performing access control list stored within the retrieved security descriptor and this is a unique control access right and this evaluates whether a requesting user has the right to control the requested object based on the defined control access rights (Van Dyke – col. 8, lines 55-67 and col. 9, lines 1-10).

With respect to claim 2, Van Dyke discloses performing a check, when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval condition (col. 9, lines 3-48); and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition (col. 5, lines 37-67 and col. 6, lines 1-67).

With respect to claims 3-4, Van Dyke discloses the steps of setting an identifier for identifying each object in association with the retrieval condition; performing a check,

Art Unit: 2172

when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the identifier of the object has been set in association with the retrieval condition; and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition if a result of the check indicates that the identifier of the access-requested object has been set in association with the retrieval condition; and wherein the association between the retrieval condition and the identifier is changed according to need when addition, modification, or deletion of the object identified by the identifier is made (unique identifier for an object: col. 5, lines 50-67 and col. 6, lines 45-56 and see fig. 3 and 4; read, write delete, modify or update: col. 2, lines 2-18).

With respect to claims 5-9, Van Dyke discloses the step of performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of OR of the matched retrieval conditions; performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of AND of the matched retrieval conditions; wherein the object is stored with attribute data, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data; wherein the object is stored with attribute data and a method for referring to an entity of the object, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data and the entity of the object referred to by the method; and wherein the access right is a specification about a user and an access type allowed to access the object (perform access control: col. 5, lines 37-49, col. 6, lines 12-24 and col. 9, lines 3-

Art Unit: 2172

30; access rights: col. 5, lines 37-67 and col. 6, lines 25-67; see fig. 4, fig. 6 and fig. 7).

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claims 12-13 are essentially the same as claims 3-4 except that they are directed to a system rather than a method, and are rejected for the same reason as applied to the claims 12-13 hereinabove.

Claims 14-18 are essentially the same as claims 5-9 except that they are directed to a system rather than a method, and are rejected for the same reason as applied to the claims 5-9 hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2172

**Contact Information**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is 703 306-4527 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on 703 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 746-7239.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Office (703) 872-9306 (Central Official Fax Number)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-6606 or 703 305-3900.

  
01/07/04  
Anh Ly

AL  
JAN. 7<sup>th</sup>, 2004